

Washington Wildlife & Recreation Program
Evaluation Criteria

Trails Category
(State and Local Agencies)

"Trails means public ways constructed for and open to pedestrians, equestrians, or bicyclists, or any combination thereof, other than a sidewalk constructed as a part of a city street or county road for exclusive use of pedestrians."

RCW 79A.15.010

WWRP - Trails Criteria Analysis					
Score	#	Title	A/D	Mult/Mx	Focus
Team	1	Need	A/D	3/15.0	Local
Team	2	Project Design	D	3/15.0	Tech
Team	3	Immediacy of Threat	A	3/15.0	Local
Team	4	Trail and Community Linkages	A/D	3/15.0	St/Loc
Team	5	Water Access, Views, and Scenic Values	A/D	2/10.0	State
Team	6	Wildlife Habitat Connectivity	A/D	1/5.0	State
Team	7	Project Support	A/D	2/10.0	St/Loc
Team	8	Cost Efficiencies	A/D	1/5.0	St/Loc
IAC Staff	9	GMA Preference	A/D	1/0	State
IAC Staff	10	Population Proximity	A/D	0.5/5.0	State
TOTAL POINTS POSSIBLE			A = 80 / D = 80		

KEY:

IAC Score	=	Criteria scored by <i>IAC staff</i>
Team	=	Criteria scored by interdisciplinary evaluation <i>team</i>
A/D	=	Acquisition or Development specific question
Mult/Mx	=	Multiplier and maximum points possible for this criterion
St/Loc/Tech	=	State priority, local priority, or technical consideration
SCORP	=	Statewide comprehensive outdoor recreation plan
Focus	=	<i>St/Loc/Tech</i> ; Criteria orientation in accordance with SCORP policy of developing evaluation systems based on three need factors: those that meet general <i>statewide</i> needs (often called for in RCW or SCORP), those that meet <i>local</i> needs (usually an item of narrower purview, often called for in local plans), and those that meet <i>technical</i> considerations (usually more objective decisions than those of policy).

WWRP SCORING CRITERIA

Trails

Team Scored

1. **NEED. Is the project needed?**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.15.070(6)(a)(v)

Consider the extent to which the project *fills an important trail need*. For example, consider:

Inventory

- Inventory of existing trails and support facilities
- Physical condition of the inventory

Use

- Amount of use of existing trails and support facilities
- Potential use of proposed trails and support facilities

Meeting the Need

- How the project meets the identified need?
- Meets a current or future need
- Unserved or under-served populations

Vision

- Is the project named by location or type as a priority in an adopted plan?
- Consistency with a clearly articulated vision of a trail network or system

Point Range 0 - 5

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

Revised May 2003

2. **PROJECT DESIGN. Is the proposal appropriately designed for the intended use(s)?**
Development; RCW 79A.15.070(6)(a)(v)

Considerations include, but are not limited to:

- Design complements need
- Design is barrier-free and accessible
- Adequate surfacing, width, spatial relationships
- Grades, curves, and switchbacks
- Appropriate setting and compatibility of uses
- Road crossings and trailhead locations
- Loops and destination trails
- Ease of maintenance
- Realistic cost estimates provided

- a. No evidence presented (0 points)
- b. Design provides estimates that do not reflect true costs, may not be safe or otherwise not meet the needs of the expected users. (1-2 points)
- c. Design is *adequate* (3 points)
- d. Design cost estimates are *realistic*. Design separates incompatible uses, provides adequate widths and surfacing for expected use levels and types, and is designed with safety as a primary consideration. (4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

Revised May 2003

3. **IMMEDIACY OF THREAT. Does a threat to the public availability of a part of the trail exist?**

Acquisition; RCW 79A.15.070(6)(a)(ii)

Consider the availability of alternatives. A project threatened with the loss of a critical link will merit more evaluation points than a proposal where other routes exist.

- a. *No evidence presented* (0 points)
- b. *Minimal threat; trail opportunity appears to be in no immediate danger of a loss in quality or to public use in the next 36 months.*(1-2 points)
- c. *Actions are under consideration that could result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for public use.* (3 points)
- d. *Actions will be taken that will result in the opportunity losing quality or becoming unavailable for future public use*
or
A threat situation has occurred or is imminent that has led an organization to acquire rights in the land at the request of the applicant agency.(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

Revised May 2003

4. **Trails and Community Linkages. Does the trail project connect trails and communities or provide linkages to community oriented facilities or resources?**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.15.070(6)(a)(iii)(iv); IAC's *State Trails Plan*, Goal 2

Applicants should show trail and/or community linkages to the evaluation team. To what extent does the trail project provide existing or potential linkages with other trails? Does the project enhance a statewide or community trails network? Broadly interpret the term *community* to include, but not be limited to, the following linkages:

- Neighborhoods, subdivisions, business districts
 - Destination facilities, such as parks, scenic overlooks, schools, churches, libraries
 - Urban to rural areas.
- a. *No* evidence is presented..... (0 points)
- b. *Marginal* trail or community linkages do not improve access to community resources; trail may cross busy streets in an unmanaged way.....(1-2 points)
- c. *Adequate* linkages (3 points)
- d. *Outstanding* trail and community linkages effectively connect existing and proposed trails, neighborhoods, and improves access to community or destination facilities in a safe manner.(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 3.

Revised April 2004

5. **WATER ACCESS, VIEWS, AND SCENIC VALUES. Does the project provide scenic values and/or direct and immediate recreational access to or views of a "significant" natural water body? Water access is the primary criterion; scenic values or views of water are secondary.**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.15.070(6)(a)(vii)(ix)

Considerations include, but are not limited to:

- How long does it take to reach the access?
- What quality is the access (for example, are there obstructions – vegetation, mud, inclines, etc.)?
- What percentage of visitors will likely use the access?
- What activities are enhanced by the access?
- Is comparable access available nearby?
- What is the quality of any view of water (consider obstructions, restrictions, distance, clarity, diversity, etc.)?
- How does distance and perspective impact the view or scenic value?
- How much diversity and variety is provided by the view? (A view may be more interesting if it simultaneously includes water, mountains, sky, or water, cityscape and other diverse elements.)

- a. *No evidence presented* (0 points)
- b. *Poor to fair* water access, views, and scenic values.(1-2 points)
- c. *Fair to good* water access, views, and scenic values (3 points)
- d. *Good to excellent* public water access, views, and scenic values.....(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised April 2004

6. **WILDLIFE HABITAT CONNECTIVITY. Will this proposal enhance wildlife's *access to food, water, or cover*?**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.15.070(6)(a)(viii)

Although wildlife biologists commonly agree that most trails act as barriers that negatively impact wildlife connectivity, such is not always the case. Consider, is the project likely to enhance access to food, water or cover? That is:

- Will it *add* any of these elements where they are lacking?
 - Will it *protect* these elements where they are declining?
 - Will the trail introduce significant human intrusions?
 - What steps will the sponsor take to mitigate or minimize impacts to fish and wildlife?
-
- a. No evidence presented, or negative impacts are not off-set (0 points)
 - b. Will introduce *marginally* more positive access than negative(1-2 points)
 - c. Will *clearly* introduce more positive access than negative..... (3 points)
 - d. Will *greatly expand* access for wildlife to food, water, and cover(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised April 2004

7. **PROJECT SUPPORT. The extent that the public (statewide, community, and/or user groups) has been provided with an adequate *opportunity to become informed*, and/or *support for the project seems apparent*.**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.15.070(6)(a)(i)

Broadly interpret the term *project support* to include, but not be limited to:

- Extent of efforts by the applicant to identify and contact all parties, i.e. an outreach program to local, regional, and statewide entities.
 - The extent that there is project support, including:
 - ▶ Voter approved initiatives/bond issues/referenda
 - ▶ Ordinance and resolution adoption
 - ▶ Public meeting attendance
 - ▶ Endorsements or other support from advisory boards and user/"friends" groups
 - ▶ Media coverage
 - ▶ The extent to which the public was involved in a comprehensive planning process that includes this project.
- a. No evidence presented (0 points)
- b. Marginal community support. Opportunities for only minimal public involvement (i.e. a single adoption hearing),
and/or
Little evidence that the public supports the project(1-2 points)
- c. Adequate support (3 points)
- d. The public has received ample and varied opportunity to provide meaningful input into the project, and there is overwhelming support;
and/or
The public was so supportive from the project's inception that an extensive public participation process was not necessary(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 2.

Revised May 2003

8. **COST EFFICIENCIES. Does the project demonstrate efficiencies and/or reduce government costs through documented use of:**

- Volunteers,
- Donations,
- *Signed* cooperative agreements or
- *Signed* memoranda of understanding (such as no cost easements/leases, maintenance/operation arrangements, or similar cost savings).

Acquisition/Development; *Assessment of Outdoor Recreation in Washington State, 2002-2007*, Chapter 5.

- a. No evidence presented.(0 point)
- b. The benefit of any such cost savings is *marginal*.(1-2 points)
- c. Cooperative measure(s) will result in *moderate* efficiencies and/or savings. (3 points)
- d. Cooperative measure(s) will result in *substantial* efficiencies and/or savings.(4-5 points)

Evaluators award a maximum of 5 points that are later multiplied by 1.

Revised May 2003

PRESCORED BY IAC STAFF

9. GMA PREFERENCE. Has the applicant made progress toward meeting the requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA)?

RCW 43.17.250 (GMA-preference required.)

State law requires that:

- (1) Whenever a state agency is considering awarding grants to finance public facilities, it shall consider whether the applicant[†] has adopted a comprehensive plan and development regulations as required by RCW 36.70A.040 (“state law”).
- (2) When reviewing such requests, the state agency shall accord additional preference to applicants[†] that have adopted the comprehensive plan and development regulations. An applicant[†] is deemed to have satisfied the requirements for adopting a comprehensive plan and development regulations if it:
 - Adopts or has adopted within the time periods specified in state law;
 - Adopts or has adopted by the time it requests a grant or loan; or
 - Demonstrates substantial progress toward adopting within the time periods specified in state law. An agency that is more than six months out of compliance with the time periods has not demonstrated substantial progress.
- (3) A request from an applicant[†] planning under state law shall be accorded no additional preference based on subsection (2) over a request from an applicant[†] not planning under this state law.

This question is pre-scored by IAC staff based on information obtained from the state Department of Community, Trade, and Economic Development, GMA Division. To qualify for the current grant cycle, the GMA comprehensive plan and development regulations must be completed by IAC’s Technical Completion Deadline.

- a. The applicant does *not* meet the requirements of RCW 43.17.250(minus 1 point)
- b. The applicant *meets* the requirements of RCW 43.17.250 (0 points)
- c. The applicant is a nonprofit organization, state or federal agency (0 points)

IAC staff subtracts a maximum of 1 point; there is no multiplier.

Revised July 1999

[†] County, city, town, and special district applicants only. This segment of the question does not apply to state agency applicants.

Prescored

10. **Proximity to Human Populations. Where is this project located with respect to urban growth areas, cities/towns, and county density?**

Acquisition/Development; RCW 79A.25.250 (IAC urban area parks)

This question is scored by IAC staff based on a map provided by the applicant. To receive credit, the map must describe the project area and contain a circle with a five-mile radius. As its hub, the circle must use the point on the project's boundary closest to a city or town. The single city or town (if any, including urban growth area boundary) with the highest population touched by the circle is counted in part "a," below. The result from "a" (cities) is added to the result from "b" (counties). This takes into account that counties with high *average* densities are made up of both high and low density areas. Projects located near cities over 5000 population *and* within high density counties receive points from both "a" and "b".

- a. Within 5 miles of a GMA urban growth area boundary or the boundary of an incorporated city/town. In either case, the score is based on the city/town population (OFM):

➤	0 -	4,999.....	(0 points)
➤	5,000 -	9,999	(1 point)
➤	10,000 -	29,999.....	(2 points)
➤	30,000 -	149,999	(3 points)
➤	150,000 -	299,999.....	(4 points)
➤	300,000 -	and above	(5 points)

- b. In a county with a population density (OFM) of:

➤	0 -	249.....	(0 points)
➤	250 -	324	(1 point)
➤	325 -	399.....	(2 points)
➤	400 -	474	(3 points)
➤	475 -	549.....	(4 points)
➤	550 -	and above	(5 points)

IAC staff awards a maximum of 10 points that are later multiplied by 0.5.

Revised May 2003

Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program

Outdoor Recreation Account

Instructions for Evaluators:

Score All. To ensure statistical parity among projects, each evaluator will score *all* proposals. While interpretation of team-scored criteria is at the discretion of individual evaluators, the guidelines in each instrument should be used.

Consistency. Individual team members may consider different aspects of projects important. Some evaluators may give high scores all the way through, while others may give lower scores. It is most important, however, that each evaluator score all projects in a consistent manner throughout the rating process.

Judge the Evidence. Final scores will depend on an evaluator's personal appraisal of, and confidence in, the information presented. Weak or unsubstantiated claims will be scored accordingly.

Voice Opinions. Evaluators are expected to discuss each proposal with other team members and presenters. Active participation and critical thinking is important. Comments on strengths, weaknesses and the number of evaluation points that should be awarded are all encouraged. Comments, however, must remain pertinent to the current project.

Two forms are supplied to assist evaluators:

1. WWRP SCORING CRITERIA pages will not be collected from team members. These guidelines are for use during the presentations. Evaluators should consult them for project scoring advice.
2. PROJECT SCORE SUMMARY pages that evaluators will use to record all scores. Evaluators will award *whole number* scores for each criteria; no fractions, please. These pages will be collected at the end of this category and at the end of each day. This procedure is designed to allow team members time to check consistency by reviewing individual scores awarded in each category.

After collecting the Score Summary sheets, *IAC staff will* factor in multipliers, total all scores, and list projects in final rank order.

Revised March 1998